

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Office Action of March 30, 2006. In that Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5. The Examiner also objected to claim 4. The Examiner also objected to the Specification and Drawings.

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpern et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,356,006) in view of Bamberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,826,420) and Will ((U.S. Patent No. 2,228,493).

Please cancel without prejudice Claims 2-4.

Applicant has amended the Specification to comply with the Examiner's requirements. Applicant has also submitted herewith corrected drawings in accordance with the Examiner's requirements

The rejection of claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpern et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,356,006) in view of Bamberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,826,420) and Will ((U.S. Patent No. 2,228,493) is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 1 have eliminated this ground for rejection. Specifically, the limitations of claims 2-4 were placed into claim 1. Claims 2-4 were cancelled without prejudice. This amendment now places claim 1 in condition for allowance. It is respectfully submitted that since claim 5 now depends from the amended claim 1, and accordingly further limits claim 1, the rejection of claim 5 is now moot.

Therefore, on the basis of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection, make the amendments to the claims of record, and allow the claims of record.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /E. Richard Skula, Reg. No. 31,061/

E. Richard Skula
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 31,061

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-2718
Dated: June 12, 2006
Docket No. MIT5039